



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,488	08/01/2003	Brent A. Detering	EGG-PI-413A RE	3026
7590 02/03/2006			EXAMINER	
Stephen R. Christian Bechtel BWXT Idaho, LLC P.O. Box 1625 Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3899			KASTLER, SCOTT R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/632,488

Applicant(s)

DETERING ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Kastler

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/17/2006.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the lengthy information disclosure statements filed 01/17/2006 and 08/01/2003 together totaling 113 reference documents. There is no requirement that applicants explain the materiality of English language references, however the cloaking of a clearly relevant reference in a long list of references may not comply with applicants' duty to disclose, see Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc., 359 F. Supp. 948, aff'd 479 F. 2d. 1338. There is no duty for the Examiner to consider these references to a greater extent than those ordinarily looked at during a regular search by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner has considered these references in the same manner as references encountered during a normal search of Office search files.

Reissue Declaration

The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because the errors which are relied upon to support the reissue application are not errors upon which a reissue can be based. See 37 CFR 1.175(a)(1) and MPEP § 1414. The errors relied upon in the reissue declaration (amending the claims merely to improve antecedent basis and/or correct textual errors without affecting the scope of subject matter of the claims; see both the reissue declaration and applicant's comments on page 22 of the pre-amendment filed on 08/01/2003) are errors which do not affect the scope of the patent claims and could have been corrected by a certificate of correction. See MPEP 1481 and 1485.

Claims 1-23 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

Art Unit: 1742

The nature of the defect(s) in the declaration is set forth in the discussion above in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 1/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument that the originally filed reissue declaration specifies an error correctable by a reissue application since antecedent basis errors have been found to be properly correctable by a reissue application is not persuasive. As stated in the above rejection, in order to be an error properly correctable by reissue, the error must render the claims or specification inoperative or invalid. In the instant case, the corrections made by the applicant, as admitted by the applicant do not affect the scope of the claims, and are seen to be of an editorial nature, correctable more properly by the submission of a Certificates of Correction. Applicant's reliance on an antecedent basis error is not persuasive because no such error is specifically recited in the originally filed reissue declaration. Error(s) relied upon in a reissue declaration must be specifically identified. For specific identification of a correctable error it is sufficient that the reissue oath or declaration identify a single word, phrase or expression in the original; specification and/or claims and explain how this word, phrase or expression renders the original patent wholly or partially inoperative or invalid (see MPEP 1414). In the instant case, the reissue declaration contains no such specific identification of any error, but rather a general statement that there are "numerous errors in the claims including antecedent basis issues". In view of this general statement, with no specific error identified, along with the applicant's statement that the scope of the claims has not been altered, any errors corrected by the applicant's pre-amendment

Art Unit: 1742

filed on 8/1/2003 are seen to be of an editorial nature, not affecting the scope of the claims and more properly corrected through the use of a Certificate of Correction.

Conclusion

Applicant is reminded of the continuing obligation under 37 CFR 1.178(b), to timely apprise the Office of any prior or concurrent proceeding in which Patent No. 5,935,293 is or was involved. These proceedings would include interferences, reissues, reexaminations, and litigation.

Applicant is further reminded of the continuing obligation under 37 CFR 1.56, to timely apprise the Office of any information which is material to patentability of the claims under consideration in this reissue application.

These obligations rest with each individual associated with the filing and prosecution of this application for reissue. See also MPEP §§ 1404, 1442.01 and 1442.04.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37


Art Unit: 1742

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Scott Kastler
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1742

sk